

REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of February 8, 2007.

Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

The Office Action

Claims 1-16, 18-30 and 35-37 remain in the application.

Claims 1-5, 7, 11-15, 19-21, 23, 25-27 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lo (U.S. Patent No. 6,987,958) in view of Reudink (U.S. Patent No. 5,757,318).

Claims 6, 22 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lo (U.S. Patent No. 6,987,958) in view of Reudink (U.S. Patent No. 5,757,318) and further in view of Evans (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0083016).

Claims 8, 9 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lo (U.S. Patent No. 6,987,958) in view of Reudink (U.S. Patent No. 5,757,318) and further in view of Nakamura (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,563).

Claims 17 and 31-34 have been cancelled.

Interview Summary

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the opportunity given by the Examiner Ed Urban to meet on April 26, 2007. At the interview, the Examiner and Applicants discussed the present application and cited prior art, Lo (U.S. Patent No. 6,987,958) and Reudink (U.S. Patent No. 5,757,318). As a result of the interview, it is the Applicants' understanding that claims amended to include "connecting an individual antenna to an individual receiver" would overcome the cited prior art.

Claims Distinguish over Cited Prior Art

Claim 1 calls for among other elements: a switch adapted to couple each receiver chain to an individual selected antenna. **Lo** couples N element antenna array to an N-by-N beamformer which creates N beams. (Col. 3, lines 7-14.) E.g., outputs of the antennas are combined into a plurality of beams. Beams are then connected to the receivers. **Lo** does not describe coupling of each discrete, physically separate, single antenna to an individual receiver to create a distinct physical signal path from the antenna to the receiver. Neither does **Lo** describe coupling each receiver to individual antennas which different from one another, as recited in claim 1.

Reudink shows signal combinations from different antennas in Figs. 1A, 1B, and 4. A "black box" is shown in Figs. 5 and 6. Applicants carefully reviewed **Reudink** and did not find detailed description or illustration of coupling an individual physical antenna to an individual physical receiver as called for in claim 1. If the Examiner maintains **Reudink** to reject claim 1, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to point out where exactly in **Reudink** coupling an individual physical antenna to an individual physical receiver is illustrated and described.

Nowhere does **Lo** or **Reudink**, taken singularly or in combination, disclose or suggest choosing a particular antenna from a plurality of antennas and connecting this individual antenna to an individual receiver. It is therefore respectfully submitted that **claim 1 and dependent claims 2-10** distinguish patentably and unobviously over **Lo** and **Reudink**.

In addition to its relationship to Claim 1, **Claim 8** calls for among other elements: the first, second and third signal path each includes fewer than or equal to two of the first, second or third sub-switches. **Nakamura** describes selecting a diversity antenna by cascading at least three switches. Fig. 4 depicts selecting one out of three antennas for Rx, and one out of two antennas for Tx by coupling three switches. Signals from antennas 2 and 2N pass through switches 20, 4, and 3 to reach the receiving portion. (Fig. 4.) Further, **Nakamura** describes selecting one out of two antennas for Rx and one out of two antennas for Tx by coupling three switches. (Fig. 5). Signals from the antenna go through switches 22, 4 and 3 to reach the receiving portion. Therefore, a signal in **Nakamura** goes

through all three switches. As called for in claim 8, the signal goes only through 2 switches. It is therefore respectfully submitted that **claim 8** distinguishes patentably and unobviously over Lo, Reudink and Nakamura, taken singularly or in combination.

Claim 11 calls for among other elements: a switch adapted to couple each of said receiver chains to a selected individual antenna. The arguments above regarding claim 1 are equally applicable here. It is therefore respectfully submitted that **claim 11 and dependent claims 12-16 and 18** distinguish patentably and unobviously over Lo and Reudink, taken singularly or in combination.

Claim 19 calls for among other elements: each individual receiver chain receiving a different one of said signals from said selected individual antenna. The arguments above regarding claim 1 are equally applicable here. It is therefore respectfully submitted that **claim 19 and dependent claims 20-24** distinguish patentably and unobviously over Lo and Reudink, taken singularly or in combination.

Claim 25 calls for among other elements: each individual receiver chain receiving a different one of said signals from said selected individual antenna. The arguments above regarding claim 1 are equally applicable here. It is therefore respectfully submitted that **claim 25 and dependent claims 26-30** distinguish patentably and unobviously over Lo and Reudink, taken singularly or in combination.

New claims 35-37 were added to alternatively claim some of the Applicants concepts.

Applicant: LIN et al.
Appl. No. 10/734,198

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons detailed above, it is submitted that all claims remaining in the application (**Claims 1-16, 18-30 and 35-37**) are in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

No additional fee is believed to be due for this Amendment. However, the undersigned attorney of record hereby authorizes charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to the Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

If the Examiner finds a personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is invited to call Marina Zalevsky, at telephone number 202-344-4975.

Dated: May 8, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 
James R. Burdett

Registration No.: 31,594
Marina V. Zalevsky
Registration No.: 53,825
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, DC 20043-9998
(202) 344-4000
(202) 344-8300 (Fax)

::ODMA\PCDOCS\DC2DOCS1\848056\1